

Labour Research

November 1975

Volume 64 Number 11 Price 20p

- 222 **Import controls**
The arguments of import controls say they will balance the budget. But the figures prove otherwise.
- 225 **Wages in trade unions**
The proportion of workers in trade unions has risen from 15.5 per cent in 1967 to 20.1 per cent in 1974.
- 229 **Trade union**
Can workers ever do better if they can handle the trade, and trade law outside from some social. With similar legislation will be problems?
- 239 **Criminal trespass**
Provisions on the law of trespass will encourage work-ins, in this racket and squats.
- 230 **Who paid for the Yes vote?**
Publication of the Referendum campaign accounts shows the Yes side had six times more money than the No campaign - largely from big business.
- 231 **Social Contrast**
- 232 **Rich and poor**
Our second survey of the Royal Commission on the Distribution of Wealth and Income shows only slight changes in the distribution of income in the last 15 years.
- 234 **Labour Party conference**
- 236 **Book notes**
- 237 **Diaries**
- 237 **Your firm**
- 238 **Industrial notes**
- 240 **Statistics**



Import controls

The Trades Union Congress earlier this year called for import controls on "textiles, clothing, knitwear and leather goods." The demand for import controls on these commodities is only one of a series of demands which have been made by unions either at national or local level for protection for their industries. The government has countered these demands with the claim that import controls, however beneficial to individual industries, would be damaging to British exports and therefore to the economy as a whole. This article attempts to show that the arguments against import controls do not stand up to close examination and that selective import controls are necessary not just to protect workers in particular industries from unemployment and to prevent permanent damage to the industries themselves but to allow the planned expansion of the economy as a whole.

Textiles, clothing and footwear

According to the most recent *Business Monitor* for the industry, imports of footwear in 1974 accounted for 15.1 per cent of total consumer expenditure on footwear; in 1970 the figure was only 8.9 per cent. Figures published by the Textile Statistics Bureau also show a large rise in the share of the fabric market taken by imports. In volume terms imports of woven cotton and man-made fibre cloth made up 57.3 per cent of the cloth available for home use in 1974 compared with 39.4 per cent in 1970. Imports of clothing have also risen. For example, Britain imported 13.3 million shirts in 1970 and 32.8 million in 1974.

As this growth in imports has been combined with a general fall in demand for these goods the effect on the domestic industry has been severe, and has resulted in immediate unemployment and a long term loss of productive capacity. Thus the Textile Statistics Bureau writes:

"There has been no fundamental change in the state of trade in the cotton and allied textile industries since the spring. Short time working has continued and at least 18 mills closed permanently in the first seven months of the year. The number of workers employed in the industry in July was about 8,200 or 9½ per cent fewer than August 1974, last year's peak." (*Quarterly Statistical Review* Autumn 1975).

Employment in the footwear industry has also fallen, from 84,800 in the first quarter of 1974 to 79,500 in the first quarter of 1975. The clothing industry has also experienced a number of factory closures and the resulting redundancies. One of the most recent examples of this has been the plan of Coats Patons to close its

Donaldson Textiles subsidiary in Alloa, Scotland with the loss of around 500 jobs.

Other industries

However it is not just the textile, clothing and footwear industries which have suffered from a combination of shrinking markets and rising imports. Workers making television tubes, motor cycles and motor cars are also threatened. On **television tubes** the *Financial Times* estimated on 27 September this year that out of an estimated total British market of 1.8 to 1.6 million television sets this year "probably 1 million of the sets . . . will have foreign made tubes in them". The problem is "not that the industry is being damaged but that it is in imminent danger of being removed completely". Increased imports have also affected the **motor** industry (see *Labour Research* October 1975) and figures published by the Society of Motor Manufacturers and Traders show that in the first nine months of this year imported passenger cars took 33.0 per cent of the UK market. In 1970 the equivalent figure was 13.3 per cent. The **motor cycle** industry is another case where imports have greatly increased in recent years. In 1970 only 78,000 motor bikes were imported into the UK; by 1974 imports had more than trebled – up to 244,000.

Expansion

If import controls are necessary to protect jobs in individual industries they are also essential if the most severe economic problem facing Britain, unemployment, is to be tackled. Currently there are 1¼ million out of work and there is no prospect at present of a general expansion of the economy. Without such an expansion further unemployment resulting from reduced demand seems inevitable.

In the past, government attempts to expand the economy have sucked in imports and the resulting balance of payments crisis has led to deflationary action by the government, the familiar stop-go pattern. Despite the fact that the pound has been allowed to float, it is clear that the present Chancellor, Denis Healey, believes that the danger of increased imports prevents a general expansion of the economy. Announcing his package of measures aimed at reducing unemployment by 100,000 he said:

"It is not possible for the British Chancellor to undertake the same general reflation of demand as we have seen in a number of countries . . . The simple reason (for this) is that a general reflation of demand would suck in imports at a time when world trade was too low to permit us to expand our exports to cover the cost." (*Financial Times*, 25 September 1975.)

Because import controls would prevent imports flooding in they would allow the government to take the necessary action to expand the economy. It would no longer be necessary to wait for the constantly receding prospect of a recovery in world trade before acting to reduce the present level of unemployment and getting on with the vital task of restructuring British industry.

Planning

There is one other strong argument in favour of import controls and that is the question of planning. A discussion document recently published by the Department of Industry states: "The heart of the Planning Agreement system will be a series of agreements between the government and companies, leading to an agreement about strategic plans." Clearly it will be impossible to develop strategic plans if at any time they can be overturned by a flood of imports.

It is clearly not sufficient to say that import controls are desirable or essential, it is also necessary to decide what form they should take. There are at least three types of control which are immediately available to the government. These are: import deposits which would require importers to pay a deposit on goods imported to the government which would then return it without paying interest after a specified period; higher tariffs on particular goods; and quotas, which are physical restrictions on the amount of goods which can be imported and which may also be applied to specific countries. There is not enough space to discuss in detail the merits of each of these types of control. However, it is important to note that only quotas offer the assurance that particular goods will not be imported and for this reason it is quotas which the textile industry has called for.

Arguments against controls

There are thus strong arguments in favour of import controls. However, the opponents of this policy have painted the results of import restrictions in very black terms. Thus Harold Lever said:

"Import restrictions on a scale that will have an immediate effect on unemployment will quickly be followed by retaliation . . . In addition and more important we shall find ourselves drawn into an economic rat race which will bring us back to the disastrous unemployment and economic stagnation of the 30s." (*Financial Times*, 26 September 1975)

If these forecasts are correct, we would do better to put up with 1¼ million unemployed and hope for an upswing in world trade. There is however evidence which suggests that the prophecies of Mr Lever do not stand up to close analysis.

The first argument deployed by opponents of import controls is that Britain is not allowed to introduce them under the terms of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the Treaty of Accession to the EEC. This argument is broadly correct, although in the case of GATT the provision for the introduction of import controls is sufficiently generous for the GATT rules not to be a major obstacle. The rules of the EEC, one of whose prime objectives is the creation of a free

trade area, are much more restrictive. There can be no doubt that membership of the EEC makes it much more difficult to introduce import controls. This was one of the reasons for the TUC's opposition to membership earlier this year. However, the recent example of French action on Italian wine imports makes it clear that it is perfectly possible to break EEC rules if the political will to do so is there. The real question is not whether import controls contravene the terms of GATT or the Treaty of Accession but whether the economic disadvantages of import controls outweigh the advantages.

Retaliation

The heart of the argument is the question of retaliation; the prospect that countries no longer able to export to Britain will retaliate by cutting down imports from Britain and so damage British exports and the British economy. There are two questions which need to be answered on this: whether retaliation is likely; and whether, if it occurs, its effects will be severe.

On the first question there is some evidence from past and present experience with import controls that retaliation may well not occur. In the 1960s Britain twice introduced import restrictions without retaliation by those countries whose imports into Britain were curtailed. Higher tariffs on finished goods were introduced between 1964 and 1966 and a system of import deposits operated between 1968 and 1970. Italy also operated an import deposit scheme from June 1974 to early this year and although Italy's EEC partners protested vigorously they did not retaliate by cutting their imports of Italian goods.

Retaliation is however possible and its effects need to be analysed. To do so it is necessary to study the composition and direction of Britain's overseas trade. The following table shows the amounts of various goods imported and exported by Britain in 1974. Imports and exports are

Table A Imports and exports 1974 (crude trade basis)

	Imports		Exports	
	£m	%	£m	%
Food	3,372	14.6	611	3.7
Drink and tobacco	407	1.7	453	2.7
Raw materials	2,364	10.2	545	3.3
Fuel	4,627	20.0	768	4.7
Vegetable oils	216	0.9	32	0.2
Chemicals	1,584	6.9	2,146	13.0
Semi-manufactures	4,789	20.7	4,005	24.3
Machinery and transport	3,902	16.9	6,052	36.7
Other manufactures	1,653	7.2	1,481	9.0
Unclassified	203	0.9	401	2.4
Total	23,117	100	16,494	100

Source Overseas Trade Statistics of the UK

not strictly comparable with each other as they are compiled on a slightly different basis. The figures do, however, give a clear indication of the composition of Britain's overseas trade.

The breakdown of exports is broadly as expected. Chemicals and other manufactured and semi-manufactured goods make up the bulk of Britain's exports – 83 per cent. With imports the position is more surprising. Britain imports more machinery and transport equipment than food and more semi-manufactures than fuel, despite the quadrupling of oil prices. Indeed the same four items which make up 83 per cent of Britain's exports also account for 51.7 per cent of Britain's imports. Looked at over a longer period the situation becomes even clearer. Whereas imports of food in the period 1970 to 1974 increased by 80 per cent in value terms, imports of machinery and transport equipment increased by 160 per cent. The huge increase in the price of oil distorts the overall picture but if trade in petroleum and petroleum products is taken out of the figures, imports of chemicals and manufactured and semi-manufactured goods increased by 160.4 per cent in the 1970 to 1974 period; imports of other items (ie largely food and raw materials) increased by 87.7 per cent. It is this rapid growth in the imports of manufactured products and the prospect of a further increase in these imports in a period of domestic expansion which import controls should check.

Import substitution

It might be argued that import controls on these products would lead to retaliation by those countries whose exports to Britain were affected. However, a relatively small number of countries produces the bulk of Britain's imports of manufactured and semi-manufactured products and with these countries the UK has a trade deficit in such goods. Table B, which shows exports to and imports from eight countries, the original six EEC countries, the United States and Japan, may make the picture clear.

The fact that the UK has a crude trade deficit of £1,447 million with the eight countries which provide 55.7 per cent of its chemicals, manufactures and semi-manufactures, the bulk of which could be produced in this country, means two things. Firstly, retaliation is less likely, as other countries have more to lose in a trade war with the UK. Secondly, even if these eight countries retaliated by blocking British exports of these goods, the increased demand in the UK for British goods to replace the imports no longer entering the country would far outweigh the loss of exports. These figures can only be a crude measure of the effect of possible retaliation to the imposition of import controls. They indicate, however, that the prophecy of disaster put forward by opponents of this policy is not founded on fact.

There remain two final arguments which need to be examined: the suggestion that import controls lead to

Table B UK trade with eight countries (original 6 EEC countries, USA & Japan 1974)

	Imports	% of imports coming from 8 countries	Exports	Crude trade balance
	£m	%	£m	£m
Chemicals	1,116	70.5	820	- 296
Semi-manufactures	1,677	35.0	1,551	- 126
Machinery and transport	3,018	77.3	2,221	- 797
Other manufactures	831	50.3	603	- 228
Total of these	6,642	55.7	5,195	-1,447

Source: Overseas Trade Statistics

higher prices and encourage inefficiency; and the argument that import controls simply export unemployment. On the first it is certainly true that inefficient firms can flourish behind protectionist barriers and firms may be able to charge higher prices and so amass large profits. A combination of these two processes occurred in Britain after the last war when import controls and the devastation of European and other competitors left the UK domestic market to British companies. If import controls were imposed in isolation today it seems likely that a similar situation would recur and although some companies might grow richer the economy overall would not become stronger. It is for this reason that it is important that import controls should be part of an overall restructuring of the economy with at least two other components: the modernisation of British industry, necessary in order to increase efficiency and production; and the extension of public ownership to ensure both that these improvements take place and that their benefits are widely shared.

Looking at the effects of the policy abroad, it is true that import controls may produce unemployment elsewhere. However there are two points to be borne in mind. The first is the fact that the recent growth of imports of manufactured and semi-manufactured products has already been matched by a rapid decline in employment in manufacturing industry in Britain. In the period 1970 to 1974 this fell by 459,000 a drop of 5.6 per cent. Import controls would simply be a reversal of this trend. The second point is that the major reason for the high levels of unemployment in the capitalist world is not restrictions on trade but the economic recession. In this situation the policies conventionally put forward instead of import controls, deflation or devaluation, would equally result in unemployment overseas, while a policy of domestic economic expansion, which in Britain is only possible with import controls, offers a better chance of getting out of the slump.

Women in trade unions

There are 8,933,000 women working in paid employment in Great Britain today.* Women at work constitute 40 per cent of the total work force of 22,297,000. Yet women account for only 26.7 per cent of TUC membership and only 31 per cent of women at work are in trade unions compared with 57 per cent of men.

These seemingly lower figures for women's participation within trade unions conceal, however, the tremendous growth in membership of trade unions by women. And this growth is of importance not just because more women are now trade unionists, but because women are becoming trade unionists despite tremendous social pressures. The burden of family responsibility still falls most heavily on women, and this is reflected in the fact that 38 per cent of all women workers are part-time. The growth in the number of women who now go out to work has come mainly from married women. In 1921 only just over ten per cent of married women in their twenties went out to work compared with almost 50 per cent in 1971. Part-time working and family pressures make union membership and participation all that more difficult for women workers. Given these conditions, the post-war growth in women's membership of trade unions has been outstanding.

Growth in union membership

Table A illustrates the growth in women's union membership in the last 15 years. Before the war the proportion of women in trade unions was fairly static, being about 15 per cent through the 1920s and 1930s, rising to nearer 20 per cent during the war itself. This increase was naturally reflecting changes in employment, with the

large-scale entry of women into industry and the absence of male workers. However, there were also changes in the attitudes of unions at this time. Previously all-male craft unions were beginning to admit women for the first time; for example, the AEU, which first allowed women members in 1943. At the end of the war, with the returning male labour force and the reversion of many women into the domestic sphere again, the percentage of women trade unionists returned to the 15 per cent level.

This percentage remained throughout the 50s. However, the late 50s and 60s saw a tremendous upsurge in the numbers of women going to work – or rather, women staying at work after marriage, and returning to work after having children. The proportion of women in the workforce rose to a third, and the numbers in trade unions also rose – to represent 17.5 per cent of TUC membership in 1962, 19.7 per cent in 1966, 23 per cent in 1970, reaching the present figure of 26.7 per cent.

As Table A indicates, the growth in women's membership has varied between unions. Some unions representing the traditional areas of women's work eg textiles have had a stagnant – or declining – female membership – due both to the saturation point for membership of women in those areas having been reached and the decline in those industries. Other areas, representing new post-war growth sectors of employment, particularly the health service, local government and public employment, have grown quite dramatically. The National Union of Public Employees, which now organises more women workers

*Figures from June 1974 census of employment published in *Department of Employment Gazette*, June 1975.

Table A Women in trade unions

Number of women members in selected trade unions and the proportion of women out of total membership.

Union	1949		1961		1974	
	no	%	no	%	no	%
TUC	1,217,083	(15.5)	1,452,046	17.5	2,772,819	(26.7)
NUPE	40,000	(24.2)	100,500	(46.7)	321,302	(63.3)
TGWU	129,366	(10.6)	158,936	(12.0)	286,826	(15.4)
GMWU	152,041	(18.9)	171,415	(21.8)	285,357	(32.3)
USDAW	136,018	(39.9)	163,107	(46.4)	203,952	(57.8)
AUEW (Eng)	34,778	(4.9)	77,456	(7.9)	171,000	(14.1)
CPSA	73,462	(50.7)	81,147	(55.7)	145,693	(67.7)
NU Tailor & Garment Workers	103,886	(76.9)	93,629	(81.4)	101,552	(87.4)
COHSE	20,090	(38.5)	27,195	(46.7)	101,059	(70.4)
APEX	15,732	(45.0)	29,731	(46.6)	72,578	(52.7)
SOGAT	55,389	(46.9)	66,107	(40.5)	69,928	(31.1)
NU Hosiery & Knitwear Workers	27,366	(74.0)	29,930	(72.9)	52,836	(72.9)
NU Dyers & Bleachers	32,780	(41.2)	25,553	(44.0)	20,138	(36.4)

Source: TUC reports for 1950, 1962, 1975

than any other union, has seen its female membership grow more than eightfold in the last 15 years. The overall growth of NUPE has been very large indeed, but the proportion of women members has risen by almost 40 percentage points in the same period. COHSE, CPSCA and APEX have also had impressive increases in both the numbers and proportion of women members. The numbers of women in the general workers' unions have also grown substantially, although women still represent a relatively lower proportion in these unions as well as in the engineering section of the AUEW.

Where women work

These developments within the trade union movement, whilst reflecting the activities of the unions themselves, also reflect the nature of women's employment. At present, women are still largely engaged in "women's work", and there are whole areas of work which are almost exclusively populated by women. These are also areas where union membership has in the past been low eg women account for 96.8 per cent of all canteen assistants and counterhands; 91.7 per cent of all office cleaners; 91.6 per cent of all nurses*. Of all women workers, 29.1 per cent are clerical workers (including secretaries, typists etc); 23.2 per cent are in service, sports and recreation (including canteen assistants, office cleaners etc); 11.9 per cent are professional, technical or artistic workers (including teachers, nurses etc) and 10.7 per cent are sales workers. As unions organise more in these areas, even more women will be brought into the trade union movement. Within manufacturing industry, where union organisation is relatively stronger, the numbers of women workers still allow for more union membership. Of all women workers, 10.3 per cent work in clothing and footwear (75.7 per cent of the labour force); 4.1 per cent in textiles (45.4 per cent of the labour force) and 3.2 per cent in food, drink and tobacco (42.4 per cent of the labour force). Other areas with sizeable proportion of women workers are electrical engineering with 38.9 per cent of the labour force being women, and printing and publishing with 32 per cent.

The unions' response

Not only do women constitute a sizeable body of union membership but, as we recently revealed, women members pay proportionately more to their unions in terms of their union contributions than do men (see *Labour Research* July 1975). Are women getting their "money's worth"? Does union policy match up to union reality? Do unions provide equal opportunity for their women members?

Very few women are members of union national executive bodies, and even fewer are officials or organisers. The latter work does tend to be regarded as incompatible with present family life and perhaps more appropriate to single people, or those with an understanding family situation. The majority of women thus appear to be ideally unsuited for such an occupation. However, given

this caution in interpretation, the imbalance of women in such positions is very great, and the same holds true for elected union leadership.

At present only two out of 38 members of the TUC General Council are women and they occupy specifically women's seats. There are no women on the executive of GMWU, TGWU, AUEW(Eng), or EETPU. Of trades councils in England and Wales, only 9.7 per cent have a woman secretary. In Scotland no trades council has a woman secretary.

Many unions have, however, recognised the difficulties which women face – largely because of their domestic role, but also because of general social discrimination – in participating within union life. Here are some examples of work going on in particular unions:

NALGO set up an equal rights working party which published a report in June 1975*. Included in this report was a survey of branch organisation. Although women made up over 40 per cent of union membership, only 19.6 per cent of branches had women secretaries and only 5.3 per cent had branch chairwomen. Women did constitute 41.5 per cent of assistant secretaries, but this is very much a "secretarial" job, involving typing etc. The report in addition found that 92.2 per cent of branches held meetings after working hours – a time particularly unsuitable for women placed with domestic commitments. Amongst the recommendations presented by the working party to attempt to overcome the difficulties of women members were: branch child care facilities; proportional representation or "special" places for women at all levels of the union; national committee on discrimination; trade union education etc.

ACTT In the spring of 1975, the Association of Cinematograph and Television Technicians published a report on patterns of sexual discrimination in the film and television industries** compiled by the union's Committee on Equality set up after the 1973 conference. Women made up 14.8 per cent of total membership, but only six per cent of shop stewards, 8.5 per cent of branch committee members and 11 per cent of executive committee members. Amongst the recommendations of the committee were: extension of child care facilities in the union; timing of branch meetings to be reassessed; a union pamphlet on discrimination; branch subcommittees on women etc.

NUPE has undergone extensive internal reorganisation, which, recognising the absence of women in leadership positions despite their majority amongst the membership, has established a number of "women's" seats on the executive. Under this reorganisation, five out of the 26 seats have been reserved for women. However, in addition to these five women now on the executive, a woman was also elected onto a general seat making six women on the executive in all, the first women ever to sit on a NUPE executive.

*Figures relating to the distribution of women in employment are taken from DE Manpower paper no 9, *Women at Work*.

**Equal Rights Working Party Report*, Nalگو, price 20p.

***Patterns of discrimination*, ACTT, price £1.

Dock labour

Britain's port workers have faced and are still facing big problems, most of which arise directly or indirectly from containerisation. There has been a sharp fall in the number of workers required to deal with a given level of traffic but containers are also one of the main factors leading to a shift of traffic away from some of the traditional ports and this has produced the most acute problems. Forthcoming legislation will deal with some of these problems, but whether it will or can deal with the whole situation is more doubtful.

Between 1968 and 1974 the non-fuel traffic passing through Britain's ports went up from about 106 million to 123 million tons or by 16 per cent. But the number of registered dock workers went down from 55,321 to 32,233 excluding supplementary workers; from 56,085 to 37,121 including them. Clearly there has been a big increase in productivity. Not all ports came within the dock labour scheme so not all port workers are registered dock workers and it is not possible to compare the national totals of traffic and workers. Most of the big ports are within the scheme however and in the case of London, Hull and Goole, and Manchester, Table A shows that output per man is up 70 per cent or more; on the Clyde it is up two and a half times.

Table A Traffic, employment and productivity

Port	Non-fuel traffic million tonnes		Registered dock workers thousands		Productivity 1974 (1968 = 100)
	1968	1974	1967-8	1973-4	
London	19.2	18.0	21.9	11.5	177
Hull/Goole	5.5	5.3	4.3	2.4	170
Liverpool	14.2	10.2	12.1	7.7	134
Manchester	5.3	5.6	2.0	1.2	170
Clyde	5.6	5.3	2.0	0.7	247

Source: Traffic, Digest of Port Statistics, National Ports Council (traffic is foreign and coastwise). Workers, annual reports of National Dock Labour Board; figures are end year so we have averaged two years. In 1967-8 none of these ports used supplementary workers. In 1973-4 the first two did not, Manchester and the Clyde did, but to only a small extent and for these two we have added on the maximum number of supplementary workers used in the year. In Liverpool the usage is bigger and we have taken the average supplementary usage for the year.

Average earnings of registered dock workers in 1968 were £29.15 and in 1974 £60.89* (in both cases this includes holiday pay, and make-up money when under-employed). The increase was 109 per cent, but since the cost of living increase in the same period was 66 per cent the real wage increase was only 26 per cent – far less than the increase in output where this can be checked. The dockers have not given their jobs away – the price of reducing the register was a reasonably good severance scheme – but clearly technological change has, as usual, brought benefits to the employers.

Changes between ports

From the dockers' point of view however the problem has not been only adjusting to a much higher level of productivity. There have also been some very big changes of fortune as between ports, as Table B shows.

Table B Traffic changes by port

Port	Non-fuel traffic million tonnes		1974 traffic 1968 = 100		Change '000 tonnes increase decrease
	1968	1974			
Tyne	2.2	1.2	53		1,028
Tees,					
Hartlepool	7.1	10.3	146	3,231	
Hull	4.8	4.3	89		512
Goole	0.7	0.9	134	234	
Grimsby	1.0	0.9	91		89
Immingham	3.5	8.8	247	5,219	
Felixstowe	1.2	3.4	286	2,237	
Harwich	1.1	2.6	231	1,464	
London	19.2	18.0	94		1,240
Southampton	1.6	3.7	224	2,039	
Dover	1.2	3.1	253	1,872	
Bristol	3.8	2.9	76		909
Newport	4.5	3.1	68		1,423
Cardiff,					
Swansea	2.4	2.7	113	301	
Liverpool	14.2	10.2	72		3,995
Manchester	5.3	5.6	104	222	
Clyde	5.6	5.3	94		358
Forth	3.5	4.2	119	664	

Directly or indirectly most of the changes in traffic flows are connected with containerisation but several factors are involved here and it is necessary to look at them more closely.

So far we have spoken loosely of "containerisation" but what is known as "unit-load" traffic includes several different things: lift-on containers (most of them going into special container ships) and roll-on traffic (some of it rail but most of it road) some of which will be carrying containers and some not. The proportion of unit-load traffic has been growing. In 1968 it amounted to 9 million tonnes in all, but by 1974 it totalled 30.6 million – almost a quarter of all non-fuel traffic. It is the increase in roll-on traffic which largely accounts for the growth at "packet ports" such as Dover and Harwich.

*Part of the increase was due to the introduction of two-shift and three-shift working.

Container ships need special container terminals* and a number of these have been built, both at ports which have been gaining traffic (eg Felixstowe and Southampton) and at those which have been losing it (eg Liverpool and London). In a few cases shifts of traffic have meant a shift to a non-scheme port. The notorious example is Felixstowe. All the US-owned North Atlantic traffic left London for either Felixstowe or continental ports, and so far Felixstowe has been outside the dock labour scheme. The reported intention of the company to sell out to the British Transport Docks Board would no doubt change this.

An even more acute problem has been caused by firms which have moved the work of loading and unloading containers from the docks, where it was done by registered dock workers, to inland depots. This was done for instance by Hay's Wharf who closed their cold stores in the London docks and moved the work to Dagenham, and by Midland Cold Storage (Vestey) who moved to Hackney. Inevitably moves of this kind lead to conflicts between workers and there were some bitter disputes in 1972 which, it will be recalled, led to NIRC cases. Statistics on inland depots are scanty but the indications are that about 12 per cent of unit-load traffic goes through inland depots.**

Containerisation and the growth of road haulage have also sharply reduced the amount of river traffic which is important in some ports, eg London. In 1967 there were 2,815 lightermen on the register in London, now only 957. Lightermen and others have started a movement called TOW, Transport on Water, to reverse the trend.

The main underlying drive to changing patterns of trade however comes from the growth of cooperation between shipping companies on their container traffic. A group known as Trio has been formed to deal with Far East container traffic. The group consists of Overseas Containers Ltd (itself a consortium of four British companies dominated by P and O and Ocean Transport and Trading), Ben Line, Hapag Lloyd (West German) and two Japanese companies. It is estimated that this will carry 80-85 per cent of UK-Far East trade and it will all go through Southampton. Liverpool, Glasgow and London will all suffer. Containerisation of UK-South Africa trade will start in 1977 and this too will go through Southampton.

This kind of concentration of particular flows of trade in particular ports has obvious advantages for the shipping companies but it has implications not only for port workers but for the country as a whole. Playing off one port against another is an age-old tactic of the shipowners and they are still at it. P and O's latest report says that there should be no "doctrinaire approach" to port nationalisation and "ports must be encouraged to compete for busi-

ness on a commercial basis." What this means in practice can be seen in a recent report by two experts which suggests that British ports are losing £10 million a year because they are not charging enough for containers.*

The coming legislation

How much of Labour's planned legislation will be brought forward in the next session was not known at the time of going to press. The newspaper *The Port* suggested at the end of August that "nationalisation of the ports industry is off for the time being but the extension of the Dock Labour Scheme is definitely on." On the other hand Harold Wilson told the Labour party conference that "work was being done" on legislation to bring the ports into public ownership.

A consultative document issued last March *Dockwork*, set out the changes proposed for the dock labour scheme. When the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act was passed in 1946 it could not be foreseen that the definition of dock work would be so important. Disputes about this go to industrial tribunals and the verdicts here have been almost uniformly unfavourable to dock workers. The consultative document proposes that "port transport work" should cover:

"the handling of goods intended for transport on sea-going vessels or coming from sea-going vessels and the preparation of sea-going or other vessels for the receipt or discharge of goods or for leaving the harbour or wharf and its approaches."

But the scheme would be extended to particular operations only if they were within a specified distance from the port or the waterside (five miles was suggested). The intention is that the scheme should apply "wherever significant third-party loading and unloading operations are carried out." Certain operations will be specifically excluded eg work carried out by employees of nationalised industries other than the British Transport Docks Board, or by employees of a manufacturer or distributor concerned only with imports for his own business. "Operations wholly or mainly involving the driving of vehicles for the transportation of goods by public road" will also be excluded. Most non-scheme ports would therefore be brought within the scheme but what would happen to inland operations is not so certain. Proposals for the extension of the scheme will, according to the document, be made by the dock labour board which will report to the Secretary of State who will consider objections and may refer difficult questions to ACAS.

These changes in the scheme will give a chance to sort out some of the conflicts. If the country, rather than the shipowners, is to benefit from the container revolution however, full national ownership of the ports and the port employers seems the minimum requirement.

*See *Labour Research* September 1970, "The Container Revolution".

**Based on number of units, *Digest of Port Statistics* 1974 vol 1.

**Container handling in British Ports* by Allan Reid, managing director Victoria Deep Water Terminal and Ken Dally, assistant director technical services National Ports Council.

Criminal trespass

by

Jeremy Smith

The Law Commission is an official body (mainly of lawyers) whose purpose is to propose reforms in the law. Being somewhat technical, their work attracts few newspaper headlines, though they have an impressive record of getting their proposals turned into legislation. But one of their Working Papers, No 54, has gained considerable notice. Published over a year ago, it proposed the creation of two new criminal offences in respect of the law on trespass, and these, in the view of critics of the proposals, would entail the most far-reaching and dangerous extension of the criminal law into areas of activity hitherto considered to be matters only of civil liability. The Commission's final report on the topic is expected early in the new year, and it is hoped that this brief analysis of their current thinking can assist the labour movement to prepare for that report.

The proposals

The main proposals in the Working Paper were these:

1 The abolition of the ancient Forcible Entry Acts and of the offence of "conspiracy to trespass" which was recently invented by the judges, notably Lord Hailsham. Conspiracy means in law no more than a simple agreement.

2 Their replacement by two new offences:

- a) Without lawful authority entering property by force adversely to any person in physical occupation, or with the right to occupy it.
- b) Being unlawfully on property and failing to leave as soon as reasonably practicable after being ordered to leave by a person entitled to occupation.

The proposed abolition of the Forcible Entry Acts and conspiracy to trespass is to be welcomed, since the existing criminal law provides adequate remedies wherever damage or violence occurs. The two proposed new offences, however, have potentially dangerous consequences. The first offence is unnecessarily wide and, as phrased, would make any squatting by homeless families in long-empty property an offence, which is hardly desirable at a time of acute housing shortage. The Haldane Society of lawyers and others have suggested that the only new offence required is one to cover forcible entry or evictions where property is being actually occupied as a residence. This would, amongst other things, outlaw strong arm tactics by landlords and oblige them to seek court orders in all cases. The second proposed offence, of failing to leave, is open to even graver objection. It would make it a crime to occupy factories, picket on company premises, squat in empty buildings, work-in,

sit-in or demonstrate, once asked by the owner or the owner's agent to leave. The maximum penalty suggested for this offence is six months in prison. Moreover, the police would be given a power of arrest of those whom they "reasonably believed" to have committed the offence. The introduction in this way of the police into industrial and landlord/tenant disputes is not a very attractive prospect. The Law Commission's rationale for their proposals (no evidence being given) was that "the criminal law should deter those who deliberately persist in interfering with the property rights of others." The rights of the homeless, pickets etc appear to have weighed somewhat less with them.

Protests

The Law Commission have, on their own account, been surprised at the volume of criticism of their proposals they have received, including many protests from different sections of the labour movement. The TUC General Council have added their voice to these and have opposed the second proposed offence, though they accept the need for the first proposed offence as it stands. One notes too the successful motion at the recent Blackpool TUC, calling for changes in the law to enable factory occupations "to be treated as accepted forms of industrial action with immunity from legal proceedings". Whilst naturally this is desirable in the interest of the trade unions it is important to bear in mind the need for all sections of the labour movement to be protected from the Commission's proposals.

There are in fact signs that the Commission are having second thoughts on parts of their proposals, in the light of the opposition to them, and according to their Secretary, they have been considering limiting the first offence to residentially occupied property, and the second offence might be replaced by, for example, making it an offence to obstruct the country court bailiff in the execution of his duty (ie when enforcing a court possession order). This would still entail the possible intervention of the police in what are primarily civil matters. Much will depend on the precise words contained in their final proposals, and it is important to be well prepared to oppose any recommendations which might weaken the labour movement. Some Conservative MPs are already pressing hard for the implementation of the Commission's existing proposals, and the Home Secretary is likely to be under pressure to act swiftly on the Commission's final proposals; hence the need to prepare, if necessary, for a quick response to them.

The author is Secretary of the Haldane Society.

Who paid for the Yes vote?

The accounts for the pro-and anti-Common Market campaigns in the June referendum have now been published.* The publication of these accounts was one of the conditions attached to the government grants of £125,000 each to *Britain in Europe* campaign and the *National Referendum Campaign*. The most startling revelation of these accounts is the huge discrepancy between the money spent by the pro-EEC campaign and that spent by the anti-EEC organisation: **Britain in Europe received and spent a total of £1,481,583 compared with only £133,630 received and spent by the National Referendum Campaign.** The pro-Common Market cause thus had more than ten times the finances that the anti-EEC forces had. And this does not include the support received from the media. Not only did *Britain in Europe* spend over half a million pounds in advertising and public relations, they also had nearly every national daily paper propagating the stay-in-the-Market message as well. As Table A shows, if it had not been for the government grant, the "out" campaign would have had an even more pitiful amount to fight on – only £8,630, compared with the £1,356,583 raised in contributions and grants by the "in" side.

Who gave?

As no upper limit was set on the amount permissible to be spent in the referendum campaign (unlike general elections), the publication of these accounts is not of much comfort to those of us who knew that the "in" campaign had many more resources at its disposal. What the accounts do show, which is of great fascination, is the names of the individual companies which donated more than £100 to the "in" campaign. The accounts list eight columns of contributions to *Britain in Europe*; only one quarter of one column of contributors is listed for the *National Referendum Campaign*. In fact, all the financial information relevant to the "in" campaign covers 12½ pages compared with three pages of information for the "out" campaign.

In Table B we list the 43 contributors who gave £10,000 or more to *Britain in Europe*. These 43 companies alone donated **£579,000** to the "in" campaign. More than half of these top donors, 27 in fact, are also important financial backers of the Tory Party, Aims of Industry, Economic League and other anti-working class organisations. The total number of companies listed as contributors to *Britain in Europe* is 291. This list reads very much like a guide to the commanding heights of the British economy – ICI, Ford, Shell, Unilever etc – they're all there. Plus all those insurance companies, banks and

Table A EEC Referendum campaign
Income and expenditure of "pro" and "anti" organisations

	Income	
	<i>Britain in Europe</i> £	<i>National Referendum Campaign</i> £
Government grant	125,000	125,000
Contributions	996,508	8,611
European Movement (British Council) grant	351,006	—
Bank interest	5,182	—
Collections at meetings	1,569	—
Sums collected for advertising etc.	2,318	—
Other income	—	19
TOTAL	1,481,583	133,630

	Expenditure	
	<i>Britain in Europe</i> £	<i>National Referendum Campaign</i> £
Printing	265,360	40,192
Advertising & public relations	587,507	64,698
Hire of rooms	31,850	2,533
Travel & admin expenses	157,393	496
Remuneration of persons employed	136,000	2,928
Office expenses	86,492	2,271
Grants to other bodies	166,309	10,000
Misc expenses	50,672	8,236
Balance for settlement of outstanding bills	—	2,276
TOTAL	1,481,583	133,630

other financial institutions which are usually so supportive of the Tories. In addition to these companies, the accounts also list 72 stockbroking firms, who between them contributed £30,575 to the "in" campaign. In addition to these "individual" donations, totalling almost a million pounds, *Britain in Europe* also received a donation of £351,006 (more than double the **total** income of

*Referendum on UK membership of the European Community. Accounts of campaigning organisations. HMSO October 1975 35p.

the "out" campaign) from the European Movement (British Council) – Brussels gold?

In staggering contrast, the *National Referendum Campaign* lists donations of more than £100 from only seven sources. The largest grant was £1,377 from the TGWU. There was one company donation – £500 from Midland engineers, Harris & Sheldon Group. All other large donations were from individuals.

How the money was spent

As Table A shows, *Britain in Europe* spent more than six times than did the *National Referendum Campaign* on printing; more than nine times on advertising and public relations; and more than 46 times on payment to people employed in the campaign. The largest amount of speakers' expenses – £1,306 – was paid to **Edward Heath** by *Britain in Europe*, who also paid £32,464 to the Conservative Central Office for administrative expenses. *Britain in Europe* paid to employ over 150 people in their campaign: the *National Referendum Campaign* had two paid employees, plus office staff and the use of Get Britain Out campaign. The *Britain in Europe* campaign also made various grants. These (like the two NRC grants of £5,000 apiece to NRC in Scotland and Wales) were made to organisations and other bodies participating in the referendum campaign. The largest of these grants was £30,332 to the CBI (annual income – over £1 million).

What these accounts prove is what was generally expected: that despite a fair and equal government grant, the other resources available to the two organisations were grossly distorted. This distortion was not in amounts alone, but also in the *source* of contributions. The *Britain in Europe* campaign had the mass support of British capitalism (aided by the media) in working for a "Yes" vote; the *National Referendum Campaign*, although it had the moral support of large elements of the trade union movement, sadly lacked the financial backing to compete on any equal basis in the referendum campaign.

Social contrast

In 1974 there were 208,000 families on London's housing waiting lists, of which 60 per cent were stated to have an acute housing need.

Mr Nigel Broackes, chairman of property company Trafalgar House Investments, has at last managed to sell his Berkshire home, Wargrave Manor. The Manor was put up for sale at the end of 1974 for £800,000. Mr Broackes has however now sold it at the "giveaway" price of £600,000, to a Swiss company. Luckily Mr Broackes has another home to move into; the more modest Deanery, at Sonning-on-Thames, which cost a mere £120,000 (before restoration and modernisation). (*Daily Telegraph* 18.9.75)

Table B Contributors to Britain in Europe campaign

Amount	Company	Industry
£25,000	Guest, Keen & Nettlefolds* Imperial Chemical Industries Marks & Spencer* Shell UK* Vickers*	Engineering Chemicals Retail Oil Engineering
£20,000	Ford Motor Co IBM Rank Organisation* Reed International	Motors Business machines Entertainments Paper, publishing
£19,000	Cavenham	Food
£15,000	Legal & General Assurance* Reckitt & Colman* Royal Insurance Co* Sun Alliance & London Assurance* Unilever	Insurance Food Insurance Insurance Food, soaps etc
£10,000	Arthur Guinness Son & Co* Baring Brothers & Co* Bass Charrington British Oxygen Cadbury Schweppes* Dickinson Robinson Group* Eagle Star Insurance Co* Grindlays Bank Guardian Royal Exchange Assurance* Hill Samuel & Co* J Lyons & Co* Johnson Matthey* Kleinwort Benson* Lazard Brothers & Co Lucas Industries* Metal Box Norwich Union Assurance* Phoenix Assurance Co* Rolls-Royce (1971)† Rowntree Mackintosh Rugby Portland Cement* S G Warburg & Co Standard Telephones & Cables Trafalgar House Investments* Turner & Newall* Unigate United Molasses Co** Whitbread & Co*	Brewing Banking Brewing Chemicals Food Paper Insurance Banking Insurance Engineering Packaging Insurance Insurance Engineering Food Building materials Finance Electrical Engineering Property Asbestos Food Food Brewing

Note: all companies marked * also contribute to the Conservative Party, British United Industrialists, Economic League, Aims of Industry etc.

†Rolls-Royce (1971) is a publicly-owned company.

**United Molasses is a subsidiary of Tate & Lyle which gave £34,750 in political donations last year.

A 71 year old pensioner dying of leukaemia and lung cancer was discharged from hospital, although he was homeless and had nowhere to go. Eventually, he broke a window and walked into a police station and asked to be arrested in order to get a bed and medical treatment. Four months later he died in the hospital wing of Pentonville Prison. (*Daily Mail* 4.7.75)

Britain's ambassador to the Paris-based Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development, Mr Francis Gallagher, found his £4,500 a year Paris flat too noisy. He therefore bought himself a house (or rather, the government's Property Services Agency bought it with public money). The cost of this house (with five bedrooms, although Mr Gallagher has no family) was £235,000. Extra work on the house cost £130,000. In all £367,000 was spent – more than 80 times the cost of the "noisy" flat. (*Daily Express* 1.10.75)

Rich and poor

The October *Labour Research* set out the latest information on the inequality in the personal ownership of property given in the first report of the Royal Commission on the Distribution of Wealth and Income. The findings of the Commission on the inequality of personal incomes are also of very great interest.

Income before tax

The top ten per cent of income recipients in the United Kingdom got just over a quarter (26.9 per cent) of the total personal income before tax in 1972-73, the latest year for which figures are available. The bottom 50 per cent received just under a quarter of the total (24.0 per cent). The remaining 40 per cent of income recipients had the other half of total income. Thus the inequality in the distribution of incomes is not so great as in the ownership of property where the top ten per cent of the adult population in Great Britain owned about two thirds of all personally owned property in 1972. But it is nevertheless very great indeed.

These figures are subject to many limitations which are fully set out in the report. In particular, investment income is understated and fringe benefits, which go

mainly to the highest incomes, are not fully covered. Thus the figures which we have just quoted understate the degree of inequality.

The two main sources for these figures are the Survey of Personal Incomes derived by the Inland Revenue from tax returns, and the Family Expenditure Survey. The Inland Revenue figures relate to "tax units" which include husband and wife in a single unit. That is why we have to use the awkward term "income recipients" in describing the distribution of incomes.

No marked trend to equality

As Table A shows, the war years had an important effect in reducing the share of the top one per cent of personal incomes which fell from 17.1 per cent in 1938 to 11.2 per cent in 1949. Since the war the share of the top one per cent has continued to decline, though more slowly. Since 1949 the share of the top two to ten per cent has only declined very slightly, while the share of the bottom 50 per cent has risen hardly at all - from 23.7 per cent in 1949 to 24 per cent in 1972-73. The middle groups who are between the top ten per cent and the bottom 50 per cent have improved their position, mainly at the expense

Table A Distribution of personal income in UK

Group	Before income tax					After income tax				
	1938-39 (a)	1949	1959	1972-73	Income range 1972-73 (lower limit)	1938-39 (a)	1949	1959	1972-73	Income range 1972-73 (lower limit)
	%	%	%	%	£ pa	%	%	%	%	£ pa
Top 1 per cent	17.1	11.2	8.4	6.4	6,236	11.7	6.4	5.3	4.4	4,462
2-10 per cent	23.4	22.0	21.0	20.5	2,857	21.9	20.7	19.9	19.2	2,398
Top 10 per cent	40.5	33.2	29.4	26.9	2,857	34.6	27.1	25.2	23.6	2,398
11-20 per cent	11.9	14.1	15.1	15.8	2,289	12.7	14.5	15.7	15.8	1,988
21-30 per cent	8.8	11.2	12.6	13.1	1,937	9.6	11.9	12.9	13.2	1,679
31-40 per cent	7.3	9.6	10.7	11.0	1,626		10.5	11.2	11.2	1,421
41-50 per cent	6.5	8.2	9.1	9.2	1,338		9.5	9.9	9.5	1,187
51-100 per cent	24.9	23.7	23.1	24.0			26.5	25.0	26.8	
Gini coefficient 1,338	42.3	41.1	39.8	37.4			35.5	36.0	33.1	
		9.5	9.9	9.5	1,187					
51-100	24.9	23.7								

(a) Not strictly comparable with later years, being derived from different sources.

Source: Tables 10 and 15, Report of Royal Commission

of the top one per cent. The Royal Commission sums up by saying that there have been "only slight changes" in the distribution of income over the past 15 years.

Table A also shows that income tax reduces the share of the top one per cent by about a third. Apart from this, however, it has only a small effect on the two to ten per cent group and no effect at all on the share of the next highest group which remained at 15.8 per cent in 1972-73. Except for the highest incomes, therefore, income tax has only a moderate equalising effect. Moreover, this is largely cancelled out by the effect of indirect taxes, that is, taxes on goods and services such as the tobacco and beer taxes, which bear most severely on the lowest incomes. Table B shows the equalising effect of taxes in terms of the Gini coefficient. This coefficient varies from zero per cent for complete equality of incomes up to 100 per cent for complete inequality (when all the income goes to a single individual). Thus the decline in the Gini coefficient from 41.1 per cent to 37.4 is a measure of the increase in equality of incomes between 1949 and 1972-73.

Table B gives the change in the Gini coefficient caused by direct and indirect taxes and shows that the net effect of all taxes is to reduce inequality by less than half of one per cent. The right hand part of Table A showing personal incomes after income tax can therefore be very misleading unless its limitations are borne in mind. What is really needed is a table showing the distribution of incomes after taking all types of taxes into account, indirect taxes and national insurance contributions, as well as income tax. Unfortunately the Royal Commission do not publish a table on this basis, and we can only hope that it will do so before too long.

The benefits-in-kind muddle

Instead, the Commission reproduces a table prepared by the Central Statistical Office showing the distribution of income after all taxes on income and expenditure, and after the inclusion of all state benefits in kind that can be allocated, such as state education, National Health Service, housing subsidies, school meals, etc. These social services obviously have an equalising effect and as Table B shows, this is greater than the effect of indirect taxes. But this surely introduces a great deal of confusion into

Table B Effect of taxes and benefits on inequality

	Change in Gini coefficient (percentage points)
Direct taxes	-2.23
Indirect taxes	+1.77
All taxes	-2.46
Benefits in kind	-2.18

Source: Table 25, Report of Royal Commission. A minus sign means less inequality

Table C Share of components in personal income

	1963 %	1973 %
Income from employment	71.2	69.2
Income from self-employment	8.6	10.1
National Insurance and other state cash benefits	8.3	10.4
Income from property	11.1	10.3
Imputed rent of owner occupiers	2.3	3.6
Less interest paid	-1.6	-3.7
	100.0	100.0
Direct taxes	14.9	19.8
Indirect taxes	13.2	12.9
All taxes	28.1	32.7

Source: Table 9, Report of Royal Commission

the subject of the distribution of incomes. The fact is that the tax system as a whole is broadly neutral in its effect on the distribution of incomes (except for very high incomes) and this important point ought not to be obscured.

Different kinds of income

About 70 per cent of personal income consists of wages and salaries, and there are three other sources of income each of which account for about ten per cent of the total: income from self-employment; pensions and other state benefits; and income from property - rent, dividends, and interest (Table C). Property income is of course by far the most unequally distributed, for it reflects the very unequal distribution of property. It is a pity that the Commission have not been able to produce figures of the distribution of property income, or of self-employment income, for it is essential to have full information on the different kinds of income. It is however, likely soon to publish its report on higher incomes from employment and self-employment.

The effect of pensions etc

The Commission does publish one extremely interesting table giving the distribution of "original income", that is, income from earnings and property income before taxes and before all cash benefits from the state. This shows that the share of the bottom 30 per cent of households fell by nearly one third between 1961-63 and 1971-73 - from eight per cent of total original income down to 5.6 per cent. Two possible explanations given by the Commission are the rise in the proportion of pensioner households and in the numbers of unemployed. This brings out the immense importance of state pensions and other benefits in mitigating the inherent inequality produced by the capitalist system. The figures in Table A, which include all state cash benefits, show that the bottom 30 per cent had 10.6 per cent of total personal income in 1972-73 compared with only 5.6 per cent of original income.

Labour Party conference

The 74th annual conference of the Labour Party took place in Blackpool from 29 September to 3 October. New members of the National Executive elected were R Tuck (NUR), W John (AUEW Engineering Section), E Williams (NUM), E Heffer (Liverpool Walton CLP) and T Jones (Labour and Socialist Clubs).

The economy

Conference carried a motion, moved by the Association of Professional, Executive, Clerical and Computer Staff, supporting the social contract and a policy of flat rate wage increases. The resolution recognised that, "the central objective of Government economic policy over the next 12 months must be to halt and reverse present trends towards ever higher rates of inflation" and urged the government to "press ahead with the manifesto policies of controlling and restructuring British industry in accordance with human and social priorities". An alternative motion moved by the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers (Foundry Section) was defeated. It supported free collective bargaining, rejected statutory control of incomes and opposed government interference in collective wage bargaining.

A motion, moved by the Association of Scientific, Technical and Managerial Staffs, asking the government to "initiate plans for the direction of investment into socially worthwhile and value-added enterprises" was carried. Conference rejected a motion, proposed by Liverpool Walton CLP, which opposed cuts in public expenditure (except in defence spending) and called for the nationalisation of major monopolies, banks and insurance companies. Conference carried a motion, moved by Workington CLP which welcomed the voluntary agreement between the TUC and Labour Party "which has formed the basis of the White Paper 'Attack on Inflation'" and called for the entire Labour movement to give whole hearted support to these proposals.

Conference defeated a motion on unemployment, moved by the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers (Engineering Section). This suggested a wide range of

measures to halt and diminish unemployment including lower interest rates, control of export of capital, higher wages and pensions and extension of public ownership. However, a motion on import controls proposed by the National Union of Footwear, Leather and Allied Trades was carried, against the advice of the NEC. The resolution called upon the government to limit imports of goods in the footwear, cotton and allied textile industries so that factory closures and lay-offs could be avoided.

A motion on industrial policy and planning agreements, proposed by the National Union of General and Municipal Workers, was also carried. This supported "a policy of indirect sanction, including making selective financial aid, selective price relaxations, and controls over inward and outward movements of capital by companies, dependent on the conclusion of a satisfactory planning agreement". A motion moved by Bristol South East CLP was defeated, on a card vote, by 5,721,000 to 407,000. The motion called for "a socialist programme of nationalisation of the 250 major monopolies, banks, insurance companies and land". Instead conference supported the proposals for a major extension of public enterprise set out in the NEC policy statement *Labour and Industry* (see below).

Social services

Conference carried a motion on housing (against NEC advice) proposed by Paddington CLP. The resolution calls on the government to reverse all cuts in housing, encourage councils to expand programmes of buying and improving houses, repeal section 105 of the Housing Act 1974 (which prevents local authorities from setting their own levels of improvement expenditure) and opposes reductions in the Parker Morris Standards of public housing. The resolution also calls on the government to empower local authorities to requisition all suitable houses and flats which have been unoccupied for more than six months.

A motion on education proposed by Wimbledon CLP was carried (against NEC advice). It called for a maximum class size of 25 to be established by 1980, opposed cuts in teaching staff and supported the abolition of private education by 1980.

The National Union of Public Employees moved a resolution on the National Health Service which was carried (against NEC advice). The resolution opposed cuts in the NHS and called for the complete abolition of prescription, dental and other charges. It demanded the total abolition of private practice as a long term aim and supported the public ownership of the pharmaceutical industry. The NUPE resolution also called for

LABOUR MONTHLY November contents include

Children: a battered service by Andrew Bennett MP
What's good for IPC ... by John Ball
"No suitable jobs" by Steve Moorcroft

35p post free; Annual Subscription £4.20
Dept LR, 134 Ballards Lane, London N3 2PD

democratically-elected management bodies in the NHS (including elected employee representatives) and supported the extension of facilities for abortion, contraception and pregnancy testing "so that they are available to all women on request, free of charge." A motion, moved by Croydon South CLP, supported changes in area health authorities so that they are put on "an elected, democratic basis" (including representation of employees) but this was defeated on a card vote by 3,457,000 to 2,819,000. Conference carried a motion, moved by the TGWU (against NEC advice), which called upon the government to ensure that "the basic state pension should not be less than 50 per cent of adult male workers average earnings for a married couple and not less than 33 per cent for a single person".

Other resolutions

St. Pancras North CLP successfully proposed a motion which called for the crime of conspiracy to be phased out as soon as alternative legislation can be introduced to

deal with those plotting serious crimes. The resolution also supported legislation to secure the right to picket peacefully.

Glasgow Hillhead CLP successfully proposed a motion criticising the government's spending on arms. The resolution viewed "with concern the failure of the government Defence Expenditure Review to fulfil the commitment outlined in the Party's October 1974 Manifesto and calls upon the government to implement an immediate reduction with the long-term objective of cutting defence expenditure in real terms".

A successful motion moved by the Electrical, Electronic, Telecommunication and Plumbing Union expressed "concern at events in Portugal which threaten a loss of the democratic rights of which the people were deprived for so long under the fascist regime" and congratulated the Socialist Party on their success in the Portuguese elections. Conference endorsed an NEC statement on Spain which expressed "total abhorrence and condemnation of the death sentences carried out in Spain".

LABOUR AND INDUSTRY

The conference adopted the National Executive Committee's major policy statement *Labour and Industry: the Next Steps*, which brings up to date the analysis and policies set out in *Labour's Programme for Britain 1973* and contains the following main proposals:

Import controls Action is needed *now* to stimulate employment and investment, and to act directly on the balance of trade. The government should introduce, for a period, selective import controls on certain manufactured and semi-manufactured goods.

Planning The government must give a much greater emphasis to planning. Britain needs a new economic and industrial plan, which lays down the key industrial priorities and target rates for growth for the various sectors of the economy. A specialised planning unit should be created for this purpose within the government machine.

Planning agreements The document states that the Industry Bill goes some way to putting into effect the proposals for planning agreements and a National Enterprise Board made in the 1973 programme, but it "falls very considerably short of our original proposals". The planning agreements system is now to be entirely voluntary. If the Bill cannot be amended at this late stage then "further legislation is essential if we are to meet the original intent of Labour's Programme". The document lists eight new powers needed to enable the government to bargain with big companies from a position of strength, including: power to compel big firms to enter into planning agreements with the government; power to ensure that capital grants to big companies are increasingly made only through planning agreements; and power to link price control with the planning agreement system.

National Enterprise Board The 1973 Programme said that a major extension of public enterprise was essential to support our strategy of economic planning, and proposed the take-over of a number of key firms in the profitable manufacturing sector of the economy by means of the NEB. The aim is to double the rate of investment in manufacturing in the next decade. The Industry Bill provides the NEB with only £1,000 million over five years, which is not enough. The government should take powers to provide capital funds for the NEB of at least £1,000 million a year over the next five years.

Finance for investment The document makes a series of proposals in order to move a greater proportion of the nation's savings into investment. The NEB should have a merchant banking function; there should be a substantial publicly-owned sector in banking; the means are needed to channel a proportion of institutional funds into industrial investment; and the Swedish system of blocked balances should be introduced, under which a substantial proportion of the pre-tax profits of companies are set aside as a fund for investment, most of which has to be deposited interest-free with the central bank until spending on investment projects is authorised by the appropriate state agency.

Correction

In the July issue of *Labour Research* we stated that Associated Newspapers had purchased the Bristol Evening Post and Western Daily Press from Bristol Evening Post Ltd. This was incorrect. Associated Newspapers do not own the Bristol Evening Post Ltd. nor have they purchased the Bristol Evening Post and Western Daily Press from this company.

Under review



The Economics of Inequality by A B Atkinson (Oxford University Press) Cloth £5.50 Paper £1.90 295pp.

Professor Atkinson is well-known for his estimates of the distribution of wealth in Britain published in his book *Unequal Shares* (1972, Pelican 1974) and widely quoted in the labour movement. This new book has grown out of a course of lectures given to students at Essex University and examines all the most important aspects of the distribution of wealth and income, discussing theories about the subject as well as the facts. The author also considers the meaning and extent of poverty in Britain and the US and the basic inadequacy of present policies for income maintenance which rely on means-tested benefits. He also examines alternative remedies – the “tax credit” scheme put forward by the Tory government in 1972 (a form of negative income tax), or the raising of benefits to the extent required to eliminate the need to rely on means tests. The author’s approach is rather neutral and academic but anyone who is interested in the subject will learn a great deal from this book.

JH

Rebels with a Cause. The History of the Hackney Trades Council 1900–1975 by Barry Burke (Centerprise) 87 pp 65p. Available from Centerprise, 136 Kingsland High Street, London E8.

Seventy five years ago the Hackney Trades Council was formed. For several years it was a small and struggling body. It supported the shop assistants in their fight for shorter hours, raised a fund for breakfasts for the children of the unemployed, protested against the imprisonment of the suffragettes. By 1919 it was supporting police on strike for the right to belong to a trade union. A local police inspector marched with 40 fellow strikers all the way from North Hackney to Tower Hill. As the author comments, nothing quite like it has ever happened since.

During the 1926 General Strike the Hackney Council of Action came into being and we can read in this booklet of how it prevented volunteer blacklegs from getting the trams out and how local tradesmen had to apply to it for permits to run their vans.

Nearly 1,600 . . .

Labour movement organisations are affiliated to the Labour Research Department. Affiliation brings the right to ask questions on your political or industrial problems—and get them answered; a free copy each month of *LABOUR RESEARCH* plus a free copy of each new pamphlet. For local organisations the affiliation fee is £10 a year.

For further details write to:

LRD 78 Blackfriars Road London SE1 8HF

Came the thirties and the Trades Council was involved in the struggles of the unemployed against the means test and of the anti-fascists against Mosley’s Jew-baiting.

Since the war the Council has been in action on issues too numerous to mention. It has backed tenants fighting rent increases, supported dustmen on strike, helped teachers campaign for better pay, fought against local rail closures proposed by Beeching, taken part in anti-H-bomb activities. The founders of the Hackney Trades Council thought it was “destined to play a large and important part, both in the trade union and the municipal life of Hackney”. They were quite right as this readable little book reveals.

NB

Do Trade Unions Cause Inflation? by D Jackson, H A Turner and F Wilkinson (Cambridge University Press) Second edition £1.50 145 pp.

This short book, first published in 1972, is probably still the best study of the problem of inflation that has come out of the British universities. It is full of useful and interesting facts, and recognises that social conflict is the root cause of inflation. The second edition has a new preface by Professor Turner in which he draws attention to one of the principal themes of the book, namely, that the great increase in direct taxation of wage earners in the late 1960s was an important cause of the wage explosion from 1969 onwards. In the task of protecting the living standards of their members, trade unions have to take into account not only the rise in prices but also any increase in income tax and national insurance deductions. Professor Turner concludes that it is now more important for trade unions to negotiate with governments than with employers. It would surely be better to say that negotiations by individual trade unions with employers now need to be supplemented by negotiations with the government by the TUC representing the movement as a whole.

RS

Big Red Diary (Pluto Press) 105mm × 147mm £1 post free from Unit 10 Spencer Court, 7 Chalcot Road, London NW1 8LH.

Why review a diary? Well, this is no ordinary diary. The size, for one thing, is nearer to a small paperback than to a conventional diary. And that goes for the contents too. The theme of this diary is women: women at work, women in the home and women in history. The diary starts with a 28-page guide to women workers, women’s rights, health and safety at work, nurseries, housing, pensions and supplementary benefits which, despite the brevity, manages to cram in the most important and useful information. The diary proper is full of both interesting facts and illustrations relating to women’s struggles. The only drawback with the diary is that it looks so beautiful that you might not want to actually write in it – and sometimes the pictures do make this difficult. Also, the inclusion of Margaret Thatcher and the first women members of the Stock Exchange seem rather out of place in a diary which largely notes the struggles of working-class women. A good buy.

BK

Diaries

Home

September

- 4 Government circular to local authorities calls for a "standstill" on spending in 1976-77 and consequent reduction in standards of some services.
- 5 Bomb explosion in Hilton Hotel, London kills two and injures sixty-three.
- 9 W Craig announces resignation as leader of the Vanguard Unionist group in the Northern Ireland Convention. This follows the decision of the United Ulster Unionist group (including Vanguard) to oppose any form of power-sharing, including coalition with SDLP (which Craig advocates).
- 11 SDLP calls for Northern Ireland Convention to be wound up as soon as possible. Public meeting in Newham NE launches R Prentice's campaign to remain MP for the constituency. R Jenkins, S Williams and T Jackson speak in his support.
- 12 Bomb explosion damages BP oil pipeline in Fife, Scotland.
- 15 W Craig withdraws his resignation as leader of the Vanguard Unionist Convention group.
- 18 Boardroom dispute at Rank Organisation results in departure "by mutual agreement" of chief executive G Dowson with a reported £150,000 golden handshake.
- 23 Government cancels Sub Martel and Hawk Swing missile projects and decides to buy American and Franco-German missiles. Pound falls to record low - £1 now worth \$2.04. Another bomb attack on BP oil pipeline near Perth, Scotland.
- 25 Government announces additional subsidies to firms providing work for school leavers and extra money for industrial development and factory building.
- 28 Three gunmen seize eight people as hostages after their attempted robbery at the Spaghetti House restaurant in London is discovered. British ambassador recalled from

Spain in protest at the execution of five political prisoners.

- 29 Basic cost of sending a letter by first class mail rises from 7p to 8½p; second class mail rises from 5½p to 6½p.

Foreign

September

- 1 Israel - cabinet approves interim agreement with Egypt to include withdrawal from parts of Sinai.
- 5 West European social democratic leaders set up "committee of friendship" to help Portuguese Socialist Party. At the meeting in London were H Wilson, W Brandt (West Germany), F Mitterand (France), the prime ministers of Sweden and the Netherlands, the Austrian Chancellor and M Soares (Portuguese Socialist Party). Portugal - General Vasco Gonçalves (former Prime Minister) abandons attempt to become commander-in-chief of the armed forces because of widespread opposition to his appointment.
- 7 Turkey - several thousand people killed in earthquake in eastern Turkey.
- 11 Lebanon - army maintains partial ceasefire after ten days of fighting.
- 12 Spain - five people sentenced to death for "terrorism".
- 18 US - Patricia Hearst captured by police 19 months after she was kidnapped by the "Symbionese Liberation Army".
- 21 Portugal - new cabinet, appointed by prime minister Azevedo, includes four Socialist Party ministers, two Popular Democrat ministers and one Communist minister.
- 27 Spain - five political prisoners executed by firing squad despite worldwide appeals for clemency.
- 28 Spain - demonstrations against the executions particularly in Basque area. Oil-producing countries meeting in Vienna agree to raise crude oil prices by ten per cent and maintain new prices for nine months.
- 29 Spain - strikes and demonstrations continue throughout Spain including over 100,000 on strike in the Basque area.

Is your firm here?



Metal Box

Year to end	1973	1974	1975
March	£m	£m	£m
Sales	277.0	353.8	455.6
Trading profit	32.5	47.1	58.7
Ord dividend	4.2	4.3	4.7

Will the milk bottle disappear? This mind bending proposition sends the board of Metal Box into paroxysms of anticipation. What a lucrative packaging market to go along with the 7,000 million food and beverage cans already produced every year by Metal Box in the UK alone - enough to reach twenty times around the world. Seven out of every ten cans made in the UK are from Metal Box, and they are the largest supplier of cartons to the British frozen foods market. Cake boxes, yogurt cartons, bean tins, washing-up liquid containers; packaging for car oil, baby foods, hairspray, paint, peanuts, soft margarine - pre-cooked, deep frozen, liquid or solid you name it Metal Box will package it, for anyone. In addition the group owns Stalrad, the domestic heating manufacturers. Metal Box employs 31,157 people in the UK in over 40 factories. But they also manufacture in 47 factories abroad - in Africa, India, South East Asia, the West Indies and Europe and a third of sales come from these overseas factories. Worldwide employees numbered 57,096 in 1974-5. Sales per employee rose by 26 per cent to £7,979 but trading profit per employee rose even more, by 81 per cent, to £1,528. Chairman A W Page received £32,000 in 1974-5 as payment, and ten other directors received over £15,000 each. Meanwhile the average employee in the UK got £2,299. A canny business indeed.



Mr Eddie Marsden

Mr Eddie Marsden, General Secretary of the Construction Section of the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers, died on 31 August. Pending an election for the post, the Acting General Secretary will be Mr J Baldwin, the Construction Section's Assistant General Secretary.

NUPE President

The Executive Council of the National Union of Public Employees has elected Mr R Reid President of the union for 1975-76. Mr Reid's post of Vice-president will be taken by Mr F West.

Industrial democracy

The Trade Secretary, Mr Shore, announced in the House of Commons on 5 August the government's plans for a Committee of Inquiry on industrial democracy. The Committee's terms of reference will be as follows:

"Accepting the need for a radical extension of industrial democracy in the control of companies by means of representation on boards of directors, and accepting the essential role of trade unions in this process, to consider how such an extension can best be achieved, taking into account in particular the proposals of the Trades Union Congress report on industrial democracy as well as experience in Britain, the EEC and other countries. Having regard to the interests of the national economy, employees, investors and consumers, to analyse the implications of such representation for the efficient management of companies and for company law."

The committee will be required to report within twelve months, to enable the government to produce legislation on industrial democracy in the 1976-77 session of Parliament. Referring to the public sector Mr Shore stated: "the Government also intend to take a radical

Industrial notes

look at the role of employees in relation to decision-making within the nationalised industries. A study has been set in hand."

Government measures on unemployment

On 24 September the government announced measures aimed at reducing the rate of unemployment. These consisted of:

- extension of the Temporary Employment Subsidy from Assisted Areas to the whole country. (For details see *Labour Research* September 1975)
- a grant of £30m to the Manpower Services Commission to provide jobs, particularly for young people in areas of high unemployment.
- a Recruitment Subsidy Scheme to encourage recruitment of school-leavers. (For details see below).
- at a later date, a grant of £20m to the Manpower Services Commission for additional training schemes and higher training allowances.
- a further £3m to the MSC to make its Employment Transfer Scheme more effective in encouraging movement out of high unemployment areas.
- aid to the construction industry.

Recruitment Subsidy Scheme

The Employment Secretary, Mr Foot, on 3 October announced details of the government's recruitment subsidy scheme, to operate from 13 October 1975 until 29 February 1976. Under the scheme an employer will receive a subsidy of £5 per week, for 26 weeks, for each young person he employs after 13 October (provided he has not created the vacancy by dismissal of another employee). Young people qualifying under this scheme must not have had more than 6 weeks work experience since leaving full-time education, must be under 20, unemployed and registered for work.

CLAIMS

Agricultural workers

A claim for £9.50 a week increases for farmworkers has been lodged by the National Union of Agricultural and Allied Workers. The claim, well beyond the government's pay limit, was submitted to the Agricultural Wages

Board on 16 September and covers about 320,000 agricultural workers in England and Wales. Last year's NUAAW biennial conference demanded a minimum wage of £40 by January 1976. The present weekly minimum is £30.50.

Municipal busworkers

A £6 a week pay claim on behalf of 70,000 municipal busworkers was submitted by the union side of the NJIC for the Road Passenger Transport Industry on 4 September.

NHS ancillary workers

The full £6 allowed by the government has also been claimed by unions representing about a quarter of a million National Health Service ancillary workers. The claim was submitted to the Whitley Council for Ancillary Staffs on 19 September, and would take effect from the second pay week in December.

Water industry

A claim for £6 a week increases for over 40,000 manual workers in the water industry was submitted to the National Water Council on 23 September.

Hull dockers

A claim for £6 a week increases from October by Hull dock workers was held up by disagreement over how the government's £6 limit should be interpreted. A port employers' pay offer of only 5p a week was on the basis that the increase would have to be offset against an interim rise of £5.95 last April. The dockers claimed that the April interim payment was not covered by the pay policy and that because the last principal settlement was in October 1974, £6 a week could be paid from October 1975. A mass meeting of the 2,000 dockers on 30 September decided to withhold industrial action pending an improved pay offer from the employers.

INCREASES

Local authority manual workers

Pay increases in line with the £6 limit were agreed on 26 September for just under a million workers covered by the NJC for Local Authorities Services (Manual Workers). Supplementary pay increases of £6 a week will take effect from 3 November, but will not be included in the basic rates of local authority workers, who include refuse collectors, sewerage workers, cleaners and car park attendants. Basic weekly rates prior to the agreement were: £30.00 (group A), £30.40 (group B), £30.80 (group C), £32.10 (group D), £33.10 (group E), £34.15 (group F), £35.25 (group G).

FACT SERVICE

Get your facts each week in Fact Service. Annual Subscription — £5.00 only. Bulk rates and sample copy on request.

LRD, 78 Blackfriars Road,
London SE1 8HF

Multiple grocery workers

150,000 supermarket and grocery workers have voted in favour of a pay offer by the Multiple Food Retailers Employers' Association. This followed the shelving of a prior agreement due to operate from 4 August, because it would have come into effect less than 12 months since the last principal increase. The new agreement is effective from 10 November. Increases will be £6 a week in all except the two bottom grades (4 and 5) where the payment is £5.20. The present provincial rates (operative from November last year) include: general assistants £24.80 (grade 5), £25.50 (grade 4), £28.70 (grade 3), £29.45 (grade 2), £30.20 (grade 1). In establishments with a weekly turnover of £5,000 or more, managers' rates range from £44.65-£67.15 a week; deputy managers £33.50-£47.30. The new increases will not be consolidated in these rates.

Baking

The Federation of Bakers and the Bakers Union have agreed £6 supplementary pay increases for bakery workers in England and Wales. Supplementary payments on top of basic rates will total £10.40 when the agreement comes into effect in December, because the 1974 £4.40 threshold payment has not been consolidated. Excluding these supplementary amounts, the current basic rates for a 40-hour week include ancillary workers £27.72; bakery operatives and stores assistants £28.50; doughmakers grade B, ovenmen, handmoulders £29.61; doughmakers grade A £30.16; chargehands £30.50; section leaders £31.17. Increases are pro-rata for juveniles, apprentices and part-time workers.

Printing

Printing and maintenance workers on national daily and London evening newspapers are also to get increases in

line with government policy, following agreement reached on 23 September by the Newspaper Publishers Association and unions representing the printing workers. The increase is a £6 supplement to weekly rates and is payable as from 1 October.

Atomic energy industry

4,000 atomic energy industry workers are to receive supplementary increases of £5.20 a week as from 1 October. This follows union acceptance of a UK Atomic Energy Authority pay offer and takes into account an 80p a week threshold increase triggered by the July retail price index and paid as from 1 August. Because it came after implementation of the pay policy, the 80p was offset against the £6 limit. Agreement was not reached on the question of consolidation of the 80p payment.

DISPUTES

BSC Llanwern

The possibility of a national steel strike by members of the National Union of Blastfurnacemen was lifted on 19 September when the NUB and the British Steel Corporation agreed to a public inquiry into the long-standing dispute over the introduction of a new blastfurnace at Llanwern, South Wales. A decision by NUB members at Llanwern to commence strike action from 14 September followed several months' negotiation between the union and the BSC over rates of pay for working on the new high-productivity furnace, and the Corporation's step in August of beginning the commissioning process despite the NUB's rejection of its pay offer. More than a third of the union's members subsequently stopped work in support of the strike, and production was run down or halted at a number of works. Following the intervention of the Advisory Conciliation and Arbitration Service in

the dispute, and the agreement on a public inquiry, normal working was resumed on 20 September.

Birmingham Post and Mail

Normal working was resumed on 10 September by journalists involved in a pay dispute with their employers, the Birmingham Post and Mail Ltd. The dispute had been official since July after the management dismissed about 250 journalists at three of the group's newspapers. The journalists – on the *Birmingham Post, Mail and Sunday Mercury* – had refused to abandon a chapel policy of calling mandatory meetings in support of their pay claim. The dismissals were followed by picketing of the company's offices by NUJ members. The resumption of normal working followed the employers' offer of £6 a week pay increases from 1 January, and the setting up of an arbitration board chaired by Professor George Thomason to look into the question of payment to journalists dismissed during the dispute.

ACTIONS AGAINST UNEMPLOYMENT

Norton Villiers Triumph

On 9 September former employees at the Norton Villiers Triumph motorcycle factory in Wolverhampton unveiled a new machine developed by the workers. The factory had been occupied by the workforce on 11 August after NVT announced plans to cease production there, and on 13 August a meeting of shop stewards and convenors representing NVT employees in Wolverhampton and Birmingham called for a public investigation into the management of the company, and for government financial assistance. NVT's attempts to force closure of their factory at Meriden in 1973 resulted in a successful occupation of the plant and launching of a workers' co-operative with government aid in March this year.

GENERAL STRIKE

MAY 1926

Trades Councils in Action

by
Emile Burns

Emile Burns' historic record of the General Strike originally prepared for the Labour Research Department in 1926 has now been reprinted and is available directly from LRD.

Price £1.40 (post free)
from LRD Publications
78 Blackfriars Road,
London SE1 8HF

LRD PUBLICATIONS

- GUIDE TO THE HEALTH & SAFETY AT WORK ACT 15p (21½p post paid)
- GUIDE TO THE £6 LIMIT 8p (14½p post paid)
- PROFITS & PRICES 35p (41½p post paid)
- HOURS & HOLIDAYS 15p (21½p post paid)
- BIG BUSINESS & POLITICS 20p (26½p post paid)
- INFLATION: What is the cause? Is there a way out? 20p (26½p post paid)

78 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 8HF

Statistics

	1974						1975								
	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept
Retail price index <i>January 74 = 100</i>	109.7	109.8	111.0	113.2	115.2	116.9	119.9	121.9	124.3	129.1	134.5	137.1	138.5	139.3	140.5
% change on year ago	+17.1	+16.9	+17.1	+17.1	+18.3	+19.1	+19.9	+19.9	+21.2	+21.7	+25.0	+26.1	+26.3	+26.9	+26.6
Basic hourly wages rate <i>July 72 = 100</i>	139.9	145.6	146.4	148.7	153.9	158.0	159.7	162.0	169.0	170.1	176.4	182.4	184.4	185.2	185.6
% change on year ago	+20.6	+21.6	+22.0	+23.6	+27.2	+29.5	+29.2	+29.9	+33.6	+32.9	+33.5	+33.2	+31.8	+27.2	+26.8
Average earnings <i>January 70 = 100 (a)</i>	181.4	185.9	189.0	191.8	200.8	208.3	206.2	209.9	212.8	215.4	217.7	221.2	231.6	233.8	
% change on year ago	+18.1	+20.5	+21.0	+21.3	+25.4	+29.4	*	*	+27.9	+30.7	+28.4	+25.6	+27.7	+25.8	
Unemployment 000s (b)	601	692	683	643	653	na	777	791	803	940	850	870	1088	1250	1249
% male unemployment rate in GB	3.4	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.7	na	4.4	4.5	4.5	5.2	4.8	4.8	6.0	6.6	6.6
Real take-home pay <i>January 1974 = 100 (c)</i>	105	106	106	106	108	108	106	106	105	103	99	99	101	102	

(a) This covers male and female workers, manual and non-manual, weekly and monthly paid, and includes overtime payments, etc. It is seasonally adjusted.

(b) Including N Ireland. Temporarily stopped are not included in the above figures.

(c) Average male earnings after tax at constant prices (see *Labour Research* September 1975)

* Affected by 3 day week.

Source: Department of Employment.

The Recession

The fall in industrial production in all the main capitalist countries has been very serious. In the year to June 1975 it fell by 18 per cent in Belgium, 11 per cent in France, ten per cent in West Germany, 16 per cent in Italy, seven per cent in the Netherlands, 15 per cent in Japan, 13 per cent in the United States and eight per cent in the UK. In the EEC as a whole (including the UK) the fall was 12 per cent. By contrast, industrial production rose by five per cent in the USSR in the year up to the first quarter of 1975, in Poland the rise was 11 per cent, in the German Democratic Republic eight per cent, in Hungary seven per cent and in Yugoslavia nine per cent.

One result of the sharp drop in production in the capitalist countries was a massive rise in unemployment. In the year to June 1975 unemployment rose by 66 per cent in the United States, 49 per cent in Japan, 54 per cent in the UK, 120 per cent in West Germany and 95 per cent in France. *Source:* OECD Main Economic Indicators and UN Monthly Bulletin of Statistics

Investment

Capital expenditure in the first half of 1975 was 11 per cent less than in the second half of 1974. Capital expenditure in manufacturing industries alone in the first half of 1975 was nine per cent less than in the second half of 1974. Total fixed capital expenditure includes investment in new buildings, vehicles, plant and machinery by the manufacturing, distributive, service and shipping industries. At 1970 prices (seasonally adjusted) total capital expenditure has fallen from £1,135m (3rd quarter 1974) to £1,132m (4th quarter) to £1,030m (1st quarter 1975) to £980m (2nd quarter 1975). Investment by manufacturing industries alone (at 1970 prices) has fallen from £516m (3rd quarter 1974) to £539m (4th quarter) to £497m (1st quarter 1975) to £459m (2nd quarter).

The fall in investment has been particularly severe in textiles, leather and clothing, and engineering, shipbuilding and metal goods. Only two industries, chemicals and metal manufacture, have increased investment in the first half of 1975.

Unemployment

In September 1975 1,249,078 people were unemployed in the United Kingdom. Of the total 943,942 were men (6.7 per cent of male employees) and 305,136 were women (3.3 per cent of female employees). 124,000 school leavers are included in the total number of unemployed.

The rate of unemployment varies between regions. In September total regional unemployment figures were as follows (male percentage unemployment in brackets): North 98,974 (9.1); North West 190,952 (8.8); Wales 76,496 (8.8); Scotland 129,561 (7.5); South West 89,586 (7.3); West Midlands 133,185 (6.9); Yorks & Humberside 108,547 (6.5); East Midlands 71,023 (5.7); East Anglia 28,205 (5.3); South East 267,572 (4.7) and Northern Ireland 54,977 (11.6).

In addition to those people unemployed there were 130,000 people in Great Britain on short-time working, including 43,000 in the West Midlands and 34,000 in the North West.